DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 494 CG 025 894

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Neglected or Delinquent Program, 1992-1993. Final Evaluation Report. Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Schools; Language Acquisition; Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; *Special Needs Students; Student Evaluation; Student Mobility; Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

The program, which lasted 136 days, was designed to provide classroom or tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. The evaluation of the program was based on standardized achievement test information (grades 2-12). Data were collected for the period from September 14, 1992 through March 26, 1993. The Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the sample--those who were English-speaking, and had a valid pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period. Norm-referenced tests were administered in grades 2-12 in a spring-to-spring cycle. Grade 2 pupils received the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). Pupils in grades 3-12 received the California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). Of the 317 pupils served, the average days of enrollment per pupil were 15.1 and the average days of attendance per pupil were 11.0. Due to a high degree of pupil mobility, there were no pupils who had attended enough days for inclusion in the evaluation sample. Therefore no assessment could be made based on the program's Desired Outcome. It is recommended that the program be continued, since it provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that alternatives to the present evaluation design be considered. Instruments used to collect data are appended. (BF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 378 494

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
# NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

1992 - 1993

Written by:
Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. THOMPSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CG025894

*The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.*

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
# NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM
# 1992-93

## ABSTRACT


Program Description: The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. During the 1992-93 school year, there was one full-time N or D reading teacher and 14 part-time tutors providing services in eight institutions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 3.87 teachers.

Time Interval: For purposes of evaluating the program based on standardized achievement test information (grades 2-12), data were collected for the period from September 14, 1992, through March 26, 1993. This interval of time provided 136 possible days for instruction.

Desired Outcome: Desired Outcome 1 (for grades 2-12) stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample--those who met the attendance criterion, were English-speaking, and had a valid pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period.

Evaluation Design: Norm-referenced tests were administered in grades 2-12 in a spring-to-spring cycle. Grade 2 pupils received the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). Pupils in grades 3-12 received the California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985).

Major Findings: The program served a total of 317 pupils in grades 2-12 for an average of 2.0 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 20 were in grades 2 through 5, and 297 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership was 52.1. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 15.1 and the average days of attendance per pupil was 11.0. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

Of the 317 pupils served in the program, 132 were girls and 185 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 157 pupils were non-minority, 156 were Black, one was Hispanic, and three were Asian American. The percent of minority pupils served was 50.5%.

Due to a high degree of pupil mobility, there were no pupils who had attended enough days for inclusion in the evaluation sample. Therefore no assessment could be made based on the program's Desired Outcome.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued, since it provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that alternatives to the present evaluation design be considered. Only a limited number of pupils are enrolled in the program long enough to attain the criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group. The value of testing under these circumstances would seem questionable.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
# NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

1992-1993

## Program Evaluation

The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. The N or D Component became a separate entity under ESEA Title I in the 1968-69 school year, at which time emphasis was placed on providing intensive service to pupils residing in institutions.

During the 1992-93 school year, the program operated in eight institutions and was staffed by one full-time N or D reading teacher and 14 part-time tutoring positions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 3.87 teachers. The term "teachers" will be used in this report to designate providers of instruction, whether in a small group or a tutorial setting. The institutions in which services occurred were: Rosemont School, Franklin County Juvenile Detention Center, Hampton Group Home, Hannah Neil Center, Joyce Avenue Group Home, Karl Road Group Home, Parenthesis Family Advocates, and Youth Advocate Services. The program served 317 pupils in grades 2-12.

## Evaluation Design

The program's Desired Outcome was as follows:

Desired Outcome 1: At least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in reading comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. The evaluation sample is defined as those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period.

In addition to data related to reading comprehension as specified in the Desired Outcome, data were also collected on total reading. This was done since federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension for individual buildings. For purposes of evaluating achievement test data (grades 2-12), the instructional period was considered to be the period from September 14, 1992, through March 26, 1993. This interval of time provided 136 possible days for instruction. Since N or D tutoring activities are not bound by the calendar of the Columbus Public Schools, the possible days of instruction as stated here include a number of days when the Columbus Public Schools was not in session. The maximum possible days of instruction does not necessarily define the actual treatment periods. Treatment periods varied according to the service patterns of program teachers, which varied from one day a week through five days a week.

### Instruments

Data were collected in three areas. Copies of the instruments used to collect data are found in the Appendix, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Service. The Calendar Worksheet was used to help program teachers collect program service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, student number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade, and hours of instruction scheduled per week. Days of instruction scheduled and served were recorded by program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. Copies of the Calendar Worksheets were collected at regular intervals in order to maintain a master file of Chapter 1 pupils served in facilities other than those provided by the school system. A copy of the Calendar Worksheet is found in the Appendix, page 11.

Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheet at the end of the school year. This instrument was used to collect the following information: data identifying those pupils who were non-English speaking, subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers, the number of hours of instruction per week, number of days scheduled for instruction, number of days service received, and the service pattern (average number of days scheduled per week for instruction). Days scheduled and days of instruction were specified for the period from September 14, 1992 through March 26, 1993. The attendance criterion for the Desired Outcome was applied to this time period, taking into account the teacher's service pattern. A copy of the Pupil Data Sheet is found in the Appendix, page 12.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). Second-grade pupils were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth edition (MAT6, 1985), which is published by the Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. This test series has two sets of norms (national and nonpublic) for fall and spring. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985.

California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). The California Achievement Tests were administered to program pupils in grades 3-12. This test series, which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation of the Chapter 1 N or D Program. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-12. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1. Many pupils served in institutions for the neglected and delinquent also attended schools in the Columbus Public Schools. Where this was the case pupils in grades 2-8 were tested in their regular classrooms as part of Districtwide Testing. Pupils in grades 9-12, and pupils not attending a Columbus Public School, were tested by their program teachers.

3. Inservice Evaluation Instrument

Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form. This locally developed instrument was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding the Orientation inservice session, which was held September 10, 1992. An abbreviated version of the instrument, the General Inservice Evaluation Form, was used at a Chapter 1 inservice meeting regarding use of the Instructional Handbook, which was held October 15, 1992, and was attended by one of the N or D teachers. The two instruments used for inservice evaluation are found in the Appendix, pages 13-15. While the evaluation design does not provide for the collection of these data (nor are the findings reported here), interim inservice evaluation reports for the two meetings were forwarded to Federal and State Programs, where they are available on request.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures for
Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program
1992-93

| Program Component | Grade | Pretest | | | | Posttest | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Test | Level | Form | Subtest(s) | Test | Level | Form | Subtest(s) |
| | | Spring 1992 | | | | Spring 1993 | | | |
| | | *Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)* | | | | | | | |
| Elementary School Reading (Grades 1-5) | 1 | --- | -- | -- | --- | MAT6 | PR | L | Total Reading[a] |
| | 2 | MAT6 | PR | L | Total Reading | MAT6 | P1 | L | Total Reading |
| | 3 | MAT6 | P1 | L | Total Reading | MAT6 | P2 | L | Total Reading |
| | | *California Achievement Tests, 1985 Edition (CAT)* | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | --- | -- | -- | --- | CAT | 13 | E | Total Reading[b] |
| | 4 | CAT | 13 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 14 | E | Total Reading |
| | 5 | CAT | 14 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 15 | E | Total Reading |
| Middle School Reading (Grades 6-8) | 6 | CAT | 15 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 16 | E | Total Reading |
| | 7 | CAT | 16 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 17 | E | Total Reading |
| | 8 | CAT | 17 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 18 | E | Total Reading |
| High School Reading (Grades 9-12) | 9 | CAT | 18 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 19 | E | Total Reading |
| | 10-12 | CAT | 19 | E | Total Reading | CAT | 19 | E | Total Reading |

Note. The MAT6 Total Reading score includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension Subtests, and the CAT Total Reading Score includes the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

[a] The MAT6 Level PR, Form L was administered to grade 1 pupils as part of Districtwide Testing. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1993-94 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 2.

[b] The CAT Level 13, Form E was administered to grade 3 pupils as part of Districtwide Testing. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1993-94 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 4.

7

P:\P505\FND93TBL
3-1-94 1:56 PM

## Major Findings

### Pupil Census Information

A total of 317 pupils in institutions was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 N or D Program during the 1992-93 school year for an average of 2.0 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 20 were in grades 2 through 5, and 297 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership in the program was 52.1. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 15.1 and the average days of attendance per pupil was 11.0. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance by grade are presented in Table 2.

Of the 317 pupils served in the program, 132 were girls and 185 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 157 pupils were non-minority, 156 were Black, one Hispanic, and three were Asian American. The percent of minority pupils served was 50.5%. Table 3 contains data on ethnic origin of pupils served by grade.

Pupils were served in eight institutions by one full-time N or D reading teacher and 14 tutors working on a part-time basis. Both full-time and tutorial instructors are referred to as teachers in this report. In terms of full-time equivalency the program was served by 3.87 teachers. The average number of pupils served by each of the 15 teachers during the school year was 21.1, with the average number of pupils per teacher at any given time being 3.5 based on average daily membership. The pupil-teacher ratio based on average daily membership divided by the teacher full-time equivalency of 3.87 was 13.5. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to the varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

The service patterns (average days of service per week) varied by teacher, ranging from one to five days per week. Of the fifteen teachers, two (13.3%) provided service five days a week, three (20.0%) served four days a week, three (20.0%) served three days a week, six (40.0%) served two days a week, and one (6.7%) served one day a week.

Pupil census information also included teacher subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 317 pupils served in the program, 49 (15.5%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 222 (70.0%) as making some progress, and 46 (14.5) as making no progress. For progress ratings by grade see Table 4.

### Standardized Achievement Test Information

Standardized Achievement test data were of two types. Reading Comprehension scores were used to assess Desired Outcome 1: that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-12) in the evaluation sample will gain at least 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension. In addition, aggregate scores were obtained for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension. Federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grade 2 and above for both Total Reading (Basic Skills) and Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) for individual buildings.

In order to be in the evaluation sample pupils had to be English-speaking, meet the attendance criterion (80% of the days scheduled for instruction) and have both a valid pretest and a posttest score. In addition, pupils who were eligible for Special Education were exempted from testing since their test scores would not be considered valid.

Of the 317 pupils served in the program, all but one were English-speaking. The number of pupils exempted from testing due to their Special Education status was 116. However in this year's program there were no pupils who met the attendance criterion for inclusion in the evaluation sample, regardless of English-speaking or Special Education status. There were matched scores (pretest and posttest) for only 14 pupils in Reading Comprehension, and for only 13 pupils in Total Reading. However, these pupils did not meet the attendance criterion for inclusion in the evaluation sample. Therefore, the program could not be evaluated in terms of norm-referenced test data.

Table 2

Number of Pupils Served and Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for N or D Program
1992-93

| Grade | Pupils Served N | Girls | Boys | Average Days of Enrollment | Days of Attendance | Daily Membership | Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 36.5 | 30.3 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 38.8 | 36.0 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 41.0 | 32.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 21.4 | 19.6 | 1.2 | 2.2 |
| 6 | 18 | 6 | 12 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 2.2 | 1.7 |
| 7 | 51 | 24 | 27 | 15.7 | 9.6 | 7.5 | 2.2 |
| 8 | 73 | 32 | 41 | 19.7 | 12.0 | 14.8 | 2.0 |
| 9 | 73 | 31 | 42 | 11.8 | 9.7 | 11.7 | 2.2 |
| 10 | 50 | 22 | 28 | 8.4 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 1.6 |
| 11 | 27 | 10 | 17 | 9.0 | 6.9 | 3.3 | 2.2 |
| 12 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 38.6 | 34.2 | 1.5 | 2.8 |
| Total | 317 | 132 | 185 | 15.1 | 11.0 | 52.1 | 2.0 |



P:\P505\RPTFND93
3-31-94 1:32 PM

Table 3

Number of Pupils Served by Ethnic Origin and
Percent of Minority Pupils Reported by
Grade Level for N or D Program
1992-93

| Grade | Pupils Served | Non-Minority | Black | Spanish | Asian American | American Indian | Percent Minority Pupils |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.0 |
| 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80.0 |
| 6 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44.4 |
| 7 | 51 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.0 |
| 8 | 73 | 44 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 39.7 |
| 9 | 73 | 34 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53.4 |
| 10 | 50 | 20 | 27 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 60.0 |
| 11 | 27 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.0 |
| 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 |
| Total | 317 | 157 | 156 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 50.5 |

Table 4

Progress of N or D Program Pupils as Rated
by Program Teachers
by Grade Level
1992-93

| Grade | Pupils Served | Descriptors of Amount of Progress | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Much | | Some | | None | |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 2 | 6 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 50.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
| 4 | 5 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 2 | 40.0 |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 6 | 18 | 1 | 5.6 | 15 | 83.3 | 2 | 11.1 |
| 7 | 51 | 8 | 15.7 | 31 | 60.8 | 12 | 23.5 |
| 8 | 73 | 7 | 9.6 | 54 | 74.0 | 12 | 16.4 |
| 9 | 73 | 13 | 17.8 | 51 | 69.9 | 9 | 12.3 |
| 10 | 50 | 4 | 8.0 | 44 | 88.0 | 2 | 4.0 |
| 11 | 27 | 4 | 14.8 | 19 | 70.4 | 4 | 14.8 |
| 12 | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 1 | 20.0 |
| Total | 317 | 49 | 15.5 | 222 | 70.0 | 46 | 14.5 |

## Summary/Recommendations

The Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial instructional services in language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. For purposes of evaluating the program based on standardized achievement test information, data were collected from September 14, 1992, through March 26, 1993. This interval of time provided 136 possible days of instruction.

The program provided instructional services in language development to 317 pupils in grades 2-12, served by 15 teachers in eight institutions for the neglected or delinquent. All but one teacher served part-time, and the full-time equivalency was 3.78 teachers. Teachers' service patterns ranged from one day a week to five days a week. The average daily membership was 52.1. There was considerable turnover in pupil enrollment during the year, as is normal in N or D facilities. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 15.1 days, and the average days of attendance was 11.0.

The Desired Outcome for grades 2-12 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the evaluation sample (those pupils who had a valid pretest and posttest measure, attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period, and were English-speaking) would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension, as measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. One pupil was non-English speaking and 116 pupils were exempted from testing due to their Special Education Status. However, none of the pupils met the attendance criterion regardless of English-speaking or Special Education status. Therefore there was no evaluation sample for this Desired Outcome.

It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued, since it provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that alternatives to the present evaluation design be considered. Only a limited number of pupils are enrolled in the program long enough to satisfy attendance criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group. In addition, many pupils are exempt from testing due to their special education status. The value of testing under these circumstances would seem questionable.

Appendix

# NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N or D) PROGRAM
## CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE
## 1992-93
## (Grades 1-12)

Student Legal Name _____ (Last) _____ (First)

Student Birthdate M M D D Y Y

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code ____ (1-5)

Sex ____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Program Code 9 3 0 6 0

Grade Level _ _

Teacher Name _____

N or D Facility Name _____

N or D Facility Code _ _ _

Public School Attended _____

Public School Code _ _ _

| 1992-93 | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F | SUB-TOTALS Scheduled (1,2) | SUB-TOTALS Served (2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aug. 31 - Sept. 25 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | H | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=10) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sept. 28 - Oct. 23 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=20) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. 26 - Nov. 20 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=20) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. 23 - Dec. 18 | 23 | 24 | 25 | H | 27 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=19) | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. 21 - Jan. 15 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | H | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | H | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=18) | | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. 18 - Feb. 12 | H | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=19) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feb. 15 - Mar. 12 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=20) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. 15 - Apr. 9 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | H | | |
| (Max. schdl. days=10) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Apr. 12 - May 7 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | //////// | |
| (No scheduled days) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \\\\\\\\ | |
| May 10 - June 4 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | H | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | //////// | |
| (No scheduled days) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \\\\\\\\ | |
| June 7 - June 11 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | //////// | |
| (No scheduled days) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | \\\\\\\\ | |

TOTALS

| Scheduled | | | Served | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

(Maximum Scheduled = 136)
(Maximum Served = 136)

**SERVICE CODES:**

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served

**RACE/ETHNIC CODES:**

1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

**ALPHABETIC CODES:**

(Write codes to LEFT of Date -- Not in Service Code Fields)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn
N = No School



P:\P505\FND93TBL
3-1-94 1:56 PM

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

April [illegible] 1993

[illegible]HEET

PUPIL DATA SHEET

'93 SCHOOL CODE _ _ _ PROGRAM CODE 3 3 0 6 0 SSN _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

SCHOOL NAME _____ PROGRAM NAME _____ TEACHER NAME _____

1. STUDENT NAME _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _
last first mi

2. STUDENT NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ GRADE _ _ BIRTHDATE _ _ / _ _ / _ _

3. AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION | | | | | |

4. PUPIL PROGRESS NONE SOME MUCH

5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? NO YES

THRU 03-26-93

6. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS) | | | | |

7. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS) | | | | |

8. ON AVERAGE, THIS PUPIL WAS SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE SERVICE _____ DAYS OUT OF _____



Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation (bif pds)

# ESEA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
# ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
# 1992-93 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____ A.M.____ P.M.____ ALL DAY____

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
- (1) Reading Elementary (1-5)
- (2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
- (3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
- (4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) N or D (1-12)
- (6) Nonpublic (1-8)
- (7) Reading Recovery (1)
- (8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
- (9) Instructional Assistant - K
- (10) ADK
- (11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
- (12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
- (13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I think this was a very worthwhile inservice. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Questions were answered adequately. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

| | | Superior | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | Program Coordinators' Presentation | | | | | |
| | a. Interest | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | b. Usefulness | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | c. Clarity of instructions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. | Evaluation Presentation | | | | | |
| | a. Interest | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | b. Usefulness | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | c. Clarity of instructions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**Please turn over for questions 7-9**

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/93)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____all day _____a.m. _____p.m. _____after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
- (1) Reading-Elementary (1-5)
- (2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
- (3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
- (4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) N or D (1-12)
- (6) Nonpublic (1-8)
- (7) Reading Recovery (1)
- (8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
- (9) Instructional Assistant - K
- (10) ADK
- (11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
- (12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
- (13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Questions were answered adequately. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings.

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____